

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/978,488	10/16/2001	Sridhar Dathathraya	SLA 1056	5148

7590 09/20/2004
David C. Ripma
Patent Counsel
Sharp Laboratories of America, Inc.
5750 NW Pacific Rim Boulevard
Camas, WA 98607

EXAMINER

NGUYEN BA, HOANG VU A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/978,488	Applicant(s) DATHATHRAYA, SRIDHAR	
	Examiner Hoang-Vu A Nguyen-Ba	Art Unit 2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 October 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) * | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed October 16, 2001.
2. The priority date considered for this application is October 16, 2001.
3. Claims 1-17 have been examined.

Drawings

4. This application has been filed with informal drawings, which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Specification

5. The specification is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. The use of hyperlinks (e.g., www.techweb.com/encyclopedia, pages 1 and 3) has been noted in this application. "AutoCorrect" option for hyperlinks in the word processor should be disabled when hyperlinks are entered in the specification.
 - b. The use of trademarks, such as JAVA, VISUAL BASIC has been noted in this application. Trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology. See next section for suggested guidelines for Applicant to follow in amending the specification to expedite correction on this matter.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- a. the dependency information of claim 8 is missing. For art rejection purposes, the examiner interprets claim 8 to depend from claim 7.
- b. the comma following the conjunction “and” should be deleted in the following claims: 1 (line 6); 4 (line 8), 5 (line 3), 9 (line 19), 10 (line 5), 12 (line 2), 13 (line 5) and 17 (line 15).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 7, 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In this instant application, claims 7, 9 and 16 recite Java™ and VB™, which are high level programming languages. It is known in the art that in order to write scripts, Javascript™ or VB™ should be used instead of the full-blown Java™ or VB™. Furthermore, Javascript™ requires a Web browser in order to be displayed (see SAMS Teach Yourself Javascript™ in 24 Hours, section Browsers and Javascript™). The teaching of Web browser, Java™, VB™, Javascript™ and VBscript™ and how to use these features are all absent in the disclosure.

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. Use of trademarks in claims:

In claims 7, 9 and 16 the use of trademarks, such as JAVA, VISUAL BASIC has been noted. Trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

To expedite correction on this matter, the examiner suggests the following guidelines for Applicant to follow in amending the specification:

i. Capitalize each letter of a trademark or accompany the trademark with an appropriate designation symbol, e.g., TM or ®, as appropriate.

ii. Use each trademark as an adjective modifying a descriptive noun. For example, it would be appropriate to recite “the JAVA platform” or “the JAVA programming language.” Note that in these examples, “platform” and “programming language” provide accompanying generic terminology, describing the context in which the trademark is used. By itself, the trademark JAVA specifies only the source of the so-labeled products, namely SUN Microsystems, Inc.

b. Lack of antecedent basis:

Claims 10 (line 5), 13 (line 7), 15 (line 2) and 17 (lines 13-15) recite the limitation "the file directory." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the limitation "the folders" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 (lines 10 and 18) recites the limitation "the folders" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 (lines 12-13) recites the limitation "the first number of folders" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

c. Vague and Unclear:

Claims 7, 9 and 16 recite JavaTM and VBTM. Besides the lack of support from the specification for the features JavaTM and VBTM discussed in section 8, it is not clear how scripts can be written using JavaTM or VBTM. For art rejection purposes, JavaTM and VBTM are interpreted to be JavascriptTM and VBscriptTM.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,038,541 to Tokuda et al. ("Tokuda").

Claims 1 and 10

Tokuda discloses at least:

supplying a plurality of folders with a corresponding plurality of scripts (see at least Figure 1, items 112, 114, 116, or 118 and related discussion in the specification; note that **folder** is broadly and reasonably interpreted to be first, second, third or manager unit which has rules or agent **scripts** to process a document according to its type);

selecting a first number of folders (see at least Figure 1, item 104 and related discussion in the specification);

processing a document (see at least Figure 1, items 104, 120, 122, 124 or 126 and related discussion in the specification; note that sorting means 104 analyzes each of the entered electronic documents, extracts a candidate of document type therefrom and classifies the electronic document according to the document type); and

adding the processed document to the selected folders (see at least Figure 1, items 112, 114, 116, or 118 and related discussion in the specification; note that following the processing step by the sorting means, the electronic document is classified according to the document type, i.e., added to the selected folder which is 112, 114, 116, or 118).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter

sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 2-9 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tokuda, as applied to base claims 1 and 10, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,729 to Matsuo et al. ("Matsuo"), and further in view of SAMS, Teach Yourself Javascript™ in 24 Hour ("SAMS").

Claims 2 and 11

Rejections of base claims 1 and 10 are incorporated. Tokuda does not specifically disclose *at least one multifunctional peripheral (MFP) device is supplied with functions comprising scanning, faxing, printing, and copying, and wherein processing a document includes using processes selected from the group including scanning, faxing, printing, and copying.* However, Matsuo discloses a MFP that is configured for managing multi-functional peripheral devices (see at least 1:35 – 67, 6:32 – 7:49). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Matsuo's MFP in Tokuda because this would provide Tokuda with control functions for scanner, fax, printer and photocopier.

Claim 3

Rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 2 are incorporated. Tokuda further discloses *in response to adding the processed document to a first number of selected folders, generating the document in a first number of scripts* (see at least Figure 1, items 120, 122, 124, 126 and related discussion in the specification).

Claim 4

Rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claims 2-3 are incorporated. Tokuda further discloses:

at least one computer workstation with an operating system is supplied, connected to a MFP device (see at least Figure 1, items 112, 114, 116, 118 and related discussion in the specification) and the method further comprising:

installing a shell extension to the computer operating system (see at least Figure 5, block comprising items 520, 522, 524 and related discussion in the specification);

in response to accessing the shell extension, generating the first number of folders (see at least Figure 5, block comprising items 520, 522, 524 and related discussion in the specification); and

writing a script for each of the first number of folders (see at least Figure 5, block comprising items 520, 522, 524 and related discussion in the specification).

Claims 5 and 14

Rejections of base claims 1, 10 and intervening claims 2-4, 11-13, respectively are incorporated. Tokuda further discloses:

in response to accessing the shell extension, selecting folders for editing (see at least Figure 5, block comprising items 520, 522, 524 and related discussion in the specification); and

editing the scripts in the selected folders (see at least Figure 5, block comprising items 520, 522, 524 and related discussion in the specification).

Claims 6 and 15

Rejections of base claims 1, 10 and intervening claims 2-5, 11-14, respectively are incorporated. Tokuda further discloses *saving the folders* (see at least 11:65-67).

Claims 7 and 16

Rejections of base claims 1, 10 and intervening claims 2-6, 11-15, respectively are incorporated. Neither Tokuda nor Matsuo explicitly discloses *wherein writing a script for each of the first number of folders includes writing a script using a protocol selected from the group including JAVA and VISUAL BASIC (VB)*. However, SAMS teaches how to write Javascript™ in 24 Hours. The advantage of the use of Javascript™ is that Javascript™ is an interpreted language which can be changed as easily as changing a HTML document as opposed to a full-blown Java™ program that requires recompilation into bytecodes (see SAMS, section Scripts and Programs). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Javascript™ or VBscript™ to write scripts in Tokuda and Matsuo to take advantage of the flexibility of Javascript™ or VBscript™ discussed above.

Claim 8

Rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claims 2-7 are incorporated. Tokuda does not specifically disclose *selecting an MFP device at which the document is to be processed*. However, Matsuo discloses a MFP that is configured for managing multi-functional peripheral devices (see at least 1:35 – 67, 6:32 – 7:49). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use

Matsuo's MFP in Tokuda because this would provide Tokuda with control functions for scanner, fax, printer and photocopier.

Claim 9

Since claim 9 recites the same features of claims 4 (a-c), 7, 6, 1 (a-d) and 3, the rejections of these claims are thus applied to claim 9.

Claim 12

Rejections of base claim 10 and intervening claims 11 are incorporated. Claim 12 recites the same features of claims 1d and 3. Therefore, claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 13

Rejections of base claim 10 and intervening claims 11-12 are incorporated. Claim 13 recites the same features of claims 1a and 4 (a-c). Therefore, claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 17

Claim 17 recites the same features of claims 13 (a-b), 12, 7, 6, 1(b). Therefore, the same rejections are thus applied to claim 17.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoang-Vu "Antony" Nguyen-Ba whose telephone

Application/Control Number: 09/978,488
Art Unit: 2122

Page 11

number is (703) 305-0103. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 6:00 to 16:15. After October, 25, 2004, the examiner can be reached at (571) 272-3701 and the examiner's supervisor at (571) 272-3695.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ANTONY NGUYEN-BA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2122

September 8, 2004